1 2		TED STATES DISTRICT COURT RN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA AT CHARLESTON
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  Plaintiff,  -vs-  RONALD BARNETTE,  Defendant.  TRANSCRIPT OF PLEA F BEFORE THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES DISTRI	Criminal Action Number:  2:14-00114  Date: July 14, 2014  HEARING E THOMAS E. JOHNSTON, JUDGE
11 12 13	APPEARANCES: For the Government:	
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li><li>16</li></ul>	For the Defendant:	BAILEY GLASSER LLP 209 Capitol Street
17	Probation Officer:	Charleston, WV 25301  Joshua Smith-Shimer
<ul><li>19</li><li>20</li><li>21</li><li>22</li></ul>	Also Present:	Keith Bowie, IRS Special Agent Sherry Payette, FBI Special Agent
<ul><li>23</li><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	-	Carol Farrell, CRR, RMR, CCP, RSA mechanical stenography; transcript

```
PROCEEDINGS had before The Honorable Thomas E.
 1
 2
    Johnston, Judge, United States District Court, Southern
   District of West Virginia, in Charleston, West Virginia, on
    July 14, 2014, at 3:00 p.m., as follows:
             THE DEPUTY CLERK: The matter before the Court is
 5
    United States versus Ronald Barnette, Criminal Action Number
 6
 7
    2:14-cr-00114, scheduled for a plea hearing.
 8
             THE COURT: Good afternoon. Will counsel please
    enter their appearances.
10
             MS. THOMAS: Meredith George Thomas on behalf of the
   United States.
11
12
             MR. HISSAM: Mike Hissam on behalf of the defendant,
13
   Ronald Barnette, who is present with me in the courtroom.
             THE COURT: Good afternoon. Mr. Barnette, I am now
14
    going to ask the Deputy Clerk to administer an oath to you.
15
             THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
16
    (RONALD BARNETTE, HAVING BEEN DULY SWORN, TESTIFIED AS
17
    FOLLOWS:)
18
19
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
20
             THE COURT: You may be seated.
21
             Mr. Barnette, do you understand that you are now
22
    under oath and you must tell the truth and, if you testify
23
    falsely, you may face prosecution for perjury or for making a
24
    false statement?
25
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
```

```
THE COURT: Throughout the course of this hearing,
 1
 2
    I'm going to be asking you a number of questions, and I want
    to make sure that you and I are communicating clearly, so if
    at any point you don't understand a question that I ask or
    anything else that occurs in this hearing, I want you to feel
    free to speak up and seek clarification.
 7
             Also, if at any time you need to confer with your
 8
    attorney, I will be pleased to pause the proceedings to allow
   you to do so. Do you understand all that?
10
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
             THE COURT: All right. I want to begin by asking
11
12
    you, how old are you?
13
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             53.
14
             THE COURT: And can you briefly describe your
15
    educational background?
             THE DEFENDANT: Quit in 12th grade.
16
17
             THE COURT: And can you read and write and understand
18
    the English language?
19
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
             THE COURT: Can you briefly describe your work
20
21
    experience?
22
             THE DEFENDANT: Operate MRS, Mining Repair
23
    Specialists.
                  We run --
24
             THE COURT: I'm sorry. You're going to have to
25
    repeat what you just said.
```

# ——PLEA HEARING —

1	THE DEFENDANT: I'm a business owner, Mining Repair	
2	Specialists.	
3	THE COURT: I didn't catch that either.	
4	THE DEFENDANT: Mining Repair Specialists.	
5	THE COURT: All right.	
6	THE DEFENDANT: And Holy Smoke Coal.	
7	MR. HISSAM: That's Holy Smoke Coal.	
8	THE COURT: I need you to speak a little bit more	
9	clearly.	
10	And was there something else?	
11	THE DEFENDANT: A theater.	
12	THE COURT: Okay. All right.	
13	THE DEFENDANT: That's about it.	
14	THE COURT: All right. And have you taken any	
15	medicine or drugs or consumed any alcoholic beverages in the	
16	last 24 hours?	
17	THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.	
18	THE COURT: Including prescription drugs?	
19	THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.	
20	THE COURT: Have you ever been treated for any mental	
21	illness or addiction to drugs?	
22	THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.	
23	THE COURT: Do you know where you are and why you're	
24	here today?	
25	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.	

THE COURT: Do you have any hearing impairment or 1 2 other disability which would prevent you from fully 3 participating in this hearing today? THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: Mr. Hissam, do you have any reason to 6 question the competency of your client? 7 MR. HISSAM: No, sir. 8 THE COURT: All right. I believe the original plea 9 agreement has been provided to me. Is this the same as the copy that was provided in advance? 10 MS. THOMAS: Your Honor, there has been one change, 11 on Page 2 of Exhibit B, which is the second page of the 12 13 stipulation of facts, two words have been marked out, and it's all been initialed by the parties. 14 15 THE COURT: Okay. Very well. All right. 16 Turning to the plea agreement then, Mr. Barnette, is that your signature which appears on the 17 18 ninth and final page of the plea agreement? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 20 THE COURT: And are those your initials that appear 21 on the other pages of the plea agreement? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 23 THE COURT: And have you read and reviewed with your 24 counsel each of the 17 paragraphs of the plea agreement and 25 the two exhibits attached to the plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: And do you wish to have the various terms 3 of the plea agreement orally stated on the record or do you 4 believe that that's unnecessary? THE DEFENDANT: 5 It's unnecessary. 6 THE COURT: And do you understand and agree with all 7 of the terms and provisions contained in the plea agreement? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 9 THE COURT: And, Mr. Hissam, have you reviewed each of the 17 paragraphs of the plea agreement and its exhibits 10 with your client? 11 MR. HISSAM: Yes, Your Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: And, Mr. Hissam and Ms. Thomas, is there any reason why either of you believe that the various terms of 14 the plea agreement should be orally stated on the record? 15 MS. THOMAS: No, Your Honor. 16 MR. HISSAM: No, Your Honor. 17 18 THE COURT: All right. Nonetheless, Mr. Barnette, 19 there are some provisions of the plea agreement I want to go 20 over with you, starting with Section 5, which begins on Page 2 and runs over onto Page 4, and it's entitled "Forfeiture." 21 22 And in that section, you agree not to contest an 23 administrative forfeiture of \$400,000. Is that your 24 understanding? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And Subsection G of Section 5 -- first of 1 2 all, let me ask you this: Do you understand a waiver is a legal term that means you're giving something up? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: All right. So then in Subsection G of 5 Section 5, do you understand that you are waiving any defenses 6 7 that you may have to any forfeiture action in this case? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 9 THE COURT: All right. Next I want to refer you to Section 10 of the plea agreement which is entitled 10 "Termination of Prosecution," and this provides that, 11 essentially, that Diana Barnette will not be prosecuted as a 12 13 result of this plea agreement if it goes forward. THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 14 15 THE COURT: All right. Next I want to refer you to 16 Section 11 of the plea agreement, which appears on Page 5 and is entitled, "Stipulation of Facts and Waiver of Federal Rule 17 of Evidence 410." Now, this section relates to a couple of 18 19 different matters, the first of which is the stipulation of 20 facts, which is attached to the plea agreement as Exhibit B, 21 and I want to turn your attention to that document now. That 22 is a two-page document, and on the second page, is that your 23 signature which appears there? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 25 THE COURT: And have you read the stipulation of

facts? 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 3 THE COURT: And do you agree that all the facts contained in the stipulation are true? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: All right. A little bit about what will 6 7 be happening from here on out. I will be asking the probation 8 officer to prepare a presentence investigation report. report will contain detailed, recommended factual findings regarding this offense and your background, among other 10 things. Ultimately, at sentencing, I will make factual 11 findings based, at least in part, on the recommendations 12 13 contained in the presentence report. Now, you've reached an agreement with the government 14 regarding certain facts contained in this stipulation, but I 15 want you to understand that in this process, neither the 16 17 probation officer nor this Court are bound by that stipulation of facts. Do you understand that? 18

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you further understand that if I make findings of fact at sentencing that are different from or inconsistent with the facts contained in this stipulation, you will still be bound by your guilty plea and would have no right to withdraw it? Do you understand that?

25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: All right. The other matter addressed in Section 11 of the plea agreement is a waiver of Federal Rule of Evidence 410. Now, Rule 410 generally provides an information or documents regarding plea negotiations, and the stipulation of fact would fall into that category.

Those things are generally not admissible at trial, in other words, the government can't use that sort of thing against you at trial, usually. However, under this waiver, if you withdraw from the plea agreement or if it's no longer any good, the plea agreement is no longer any good because you violated one or more of its terms, and there is a subsequent trial, that under this waiver, the government would be allowed to present stipulation of fact in its case in chief or for other purposes at that trial. Do you understand that waiver?

THE COURT: All right. Next I want to refer you to Section 12 of the plea agreement which starts on Page 5 and runs over onto Page 6. It's entitled, "Agreement on Sentencing Guidelines." And before we get into it, I want to ask you, has your attorney talked with you about the Federal Sentencing Guidelines and how they generally work?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And has he showed you that chart in the back of the book?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Well, working from that chart, I'm going to have a similar discussion with you. If you will recall from the chart, on the left side of the page there is a series of numbers that run from low to high as you go down the page. Those are offense levels. And the offense level is calculated by starting out with a base offense level, which is a starting point, and that can be adjusted upward or downward, depending on the facts and circumstances of the case. Then you generally arrive at an adjusted offense level. Then consideration is usually given to a reduction for acceptance of responsibility. Has your attorney talked with you about that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And then you generally after that arrive at a total offense level.

Then you go up to the top of the chart and there are six criminal history categories, and you would fall under one of those, depending on the number of points, if any, assigned to any prior convictions that you may have.

Then you combine the criminal history category with the total offense level and arrive at a point in the chart that gives a range of months of imprisonment, and -- well, do you understand all this about the guidelines I've told you so far?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Once we arrive at that guideline range -- and, by the way, there are certain parts of the chart where certain ranges would fall within a part of the chart where there would be alternatives to incarceration.

Once we arrive at that range, then I have the authority to sentence you within that range or, under some circumstances, I would have the authority to sentence you outside of that range, either above it or below it. If I do that, based on the factors identified in the guidelines themselves, it's generally known as a departure. If I sentence you outside of the guideline range, again, above it or below it, based on factors outside of the guidelines, it's generally known as a variance. Do you understand everything I've told you about the guidelines?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Has your attorney gone over all these things with you as well?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. With all that in mind then,
Section 12 contains an agreement that you reached with the
government regarding one or more provisions of the Federal
Sentencing Guidelines. Now, this is similar to the
stipulation of fact in that the probation officer will include
in the presentence report a recommended guideline calculation.
Ultimately, at sentencing, I'll make guideline findings based,

at least in part, on the probation officer's recommendation.

Now, you and the government have reached an agreement with regard to certain provisions of the guidelines here, but I want you to understand once again that in this process, neither the probation officer nor this Court are bound by that agreement on the guidelines. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you further understand that if I make guideline findings at sentencing that are different from or inconsistent with the -- with this agreement, you will still be bound by your guilty plea and would have no right to withdraw it? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Next I want to refer you to Section 13 of the plea agreement which appears on Page 6 and is entitled "Waiver of Appeal and Collateral Attack." Now, this section relates to a couple of different procedures that I want to describe to you briefly.

An appeal is a procedure by which a party to a case before a District Court like this one and a defendant in a criminal case, it's often a defendant, goes to the Court of Appeals, which is the next level up of the court system, and argues that certain errors or mistakes may have taken place in their case before the District Court.

A collateral attack is similar but is a separate

civil case that may be filed after a criminal case is over, sometimes referred to as a habeas corpus petition, and in the collateral attack, the defendant may also argue that certain errors or mistakes may have taken place in the defendant's criminal case before the District Court.

Now, do you understand those two proceedings, at least as I've briefly described them to you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: The other thing I want to go over with you is that there are two phases to a criminal case.

The first phase is the phase in which guilt or innocence is determined, sometimes by a trial, much more often by guilty plea like what we're doing today. That phase of the case begins -- starts at the very beginning of the case and runs all the way to the point where a finding of guilt is made or innocence is made.

If a finding of guilt is made, then we go to the second part or second phase of the criminal case in which the penalty is determined, which ultimately concludes in a sentencing hearing at the end of the case.

Now, do you understand the two phases of a criminal case as I briefly described them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. With all that in mind then, I want to go over -- this first paragraph in Section 13 contains

an appeal waiver. I want to go over that with you now. 1 2 Do you understand that you waive the right to appeal 3 your conviction and any sentence of imprisonment, fine or term of supervised release or the manner in which the sentence was 4 5 determined on any ground whatsoever with one exception: You may appeal any sentence that is greater than the maximum 6 7 penalty set forth by statute; do you understand that waiver? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Anything about it that you don't 9 understand or you have questions about? 10 THE DEFENDANT: No. sir. 11 12 THE COURT: All right. And the second paragraph, do 13 you also understand that you may not file a later civil proceeding, sometimes referred to as a collateral attack or a 14 15 habeas corpus position, challenging your plea, conviction, or sentence? Do you understand that? 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 18 THE COURT: Finally, do you understand that you are in no event waiving your right to claim ineffective assistance 19 of counsel either on appeal or by collateral attack? 20 21 Do you want me to go over that one again? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 23 THE COURT: All right. Do you understand that you 24 are in no event waiving your right to claim ineffective assistance of counsel, either on appeal or by collateral 25

# ——PLEA HEARING ——

1	attack?
2	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
3	THE COURT: Do you understand that now?
4	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
5	THE COURT: All right. Finally, I want to turn your
6	attention to Section 14 on Page 7. It's entitled "Waiver of
7	FOIA and Privacy Right." This waiver means you can't go back
8	after this case is over and seek documents or other
9	information about this case from the government, even with a
10	Freedom of Information request. Do you understand that?
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
12	THE COURT: And I've neglected one thing. In the
13	final copy of the stipulation of fact, on Page 2, there is a
14	handwritten change. And do you agree with that change?
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
16	THE COURT: Are those your initials next to that
17	change?
18	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
19	THE COURT: In handwriting.
20	All right. Very well. Mr. Hissam, have you
21	thoroughly reviewed the plea agreement with your client?
22	MR. HISSAM: Yes, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: And do you believe that he fully
24	understands the various terms and provisions of the plea
25	agreement, including the waivers and other matters that I have

# ——PLEA HEARING ——

1	<pre>gone over with him this afternoon?</pre>
2	
	MR. HISSAM: Yes, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Barnette, have you reviewed the
4	agreement in detail with your attorney?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
6	THE COURT: And do you believe that you've had
7	adequate time to discuss your case fully with your attorney?
8	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Has your attorney answered any questions
10	that you have about your case?
11	THE DEFENDANT: What?
12	THE COURT: Has your attorney answered any questions
13	that you've had about your case?
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Hissam, during your representation of
16	the defendant, has he been cooperative?
17	MR. HISSAM: Yes, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Barnette, has anything further been
19	agreed to, either orally or in writing, that is not contained
20	in the plea agreement?
21	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
22	THE COURT: All right. I'll order that the plea
23	agreement be filed. I will find that the defendant
24	understands and agrees to the terms contained in the plea
25	agreement. I will defer accepting or rejecting the plea

agreement until sentencing, after the presentence report has been received and considered.

Mr. Barnette, have you received and read and reviewed with your attorney the information or charging document that has been proposed in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And do you understand the charges contained in the information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Would you like me to read the information to you or will you waive the reading of the information?

12 THE DEFENDANT: I'll waive the right.

THE COURT: All right. As I understand it, you're pleading guilty to a single-count information which charges you with making a false statement in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(2). I now want to go over that charge and that statute in just a little bit more detail with you.

Section 1001(a)(2) provides, in pertinent part, that "whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the executive, legislative or judicial branch of the Government of the United States knowingly and willfully makes any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than five years or both."

Now, in order to establish that charge against you,

the government would have to prove each of the following elements, each beyond a reasonable doubt: And they are, first, that you made a false statement in a matter involving a governmental agency; and, second, that you acted knowingly and willfully; and, third, that the false statement was material to a matter within the jurisdiction of the agency.

Now, I want to share with you some definitions that apply to what I just told you.

Criminal investigations conducted by the IRS are matters within the jurisdiction of a branch of the United States Government for purposes of Section 1001.

And an act is done knowingly if done voluntarily and intentionally, not because of mistake or accident or other innocent reason.

For purposes of this statute, an act is done willfully if it is done deliberately and not by accident.

A false statement may take the form of an affirmative misrepresentation or the concealment of a material fact. In determining whether a statement is material, it is irrelevant whether the false statement actually influenced or affected the decision-making process of the agency or fact-finding body. Rather, a statement is material if it has a natural tendency to influence or is capable of influencing the decision-making body to which it was addressed.

Are there any objections to the elements as I have

described them?

MS. THOMAS: Your Honor, after the last hearing, I was reminded of a couple of recent cases regarding the willfulness standard, and I apologize for bringing it up now and not during the last hearing, but I would like to bring it to the Court's attention, if I may.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. THOMAS: Recently, I believe it was on March the 10th, the Solicitor General filed two oppositions for petitions of certiorari in two cases, one involved a First Circuit case and one involved a Ninth Circuit case, regarding the term "willfully," in a 1001 context or a false statement context. The department argued in that opposition to petition that "willfully" requires proof that the defendant knew his conduct was unlawful, rather than the deliberately with knowledge standard. I wanted to bring that to the Court's attention.

THE COURT: The government argued for the heightened standard?

MS. THOMAS: Yes. The government looked the Bryan standard which is a 1998 case that is put forth in 924(a)(1)(D), I believe that's what the Court was interpreting, an act was undertaken with a bad purpose which requires the government to prove the defendant acted with knowledge that his conduct was unlawful.

I would suggest that in either case, the one that is before the Court right now and in the last case, the government would be able to prove both standards beyond a reasonable doubt, but I did want to bring this to the Court's attention.

THE COURT: Well, this might be just the opportunity I was looking for to clarify this. I'm not so sure I agree with the government in those cases. I think that "knowingly" and "willfully" in the context of 1001 are basically interchangeable. Apparently, that's not the position of the government, at least that the government's taken in those two cases you've indicated.

I mean, if you all want to submit something on that,

I'm happy to -- this may be just the opportunity I'm looking

for to sort of do my restatement, for what it's worth, on the

issue. This is something I'll be looking at sort of as we

move toward sentencing. I don't doubt that probably there is

a basis here, but I think it's important to have the law

clarified. So I really think that's -- that's what I'm

thinking about doing is writing an opinion where I go through

all this and sort of figure out where I fall out on this whole

mess because if you really start looking at the definition of

"willfully," the Courts have done a pretty lousy job with it.

In fact, I would argue that both Congress and the Courts have

pretty well abused the word "willfully" almost out of

- 1 existence. So you're welcome to file something on it if you'd
  2 like.
- 3 MS. THOMAS: When would the Court like something on 4 that?
- 5 THE COURT: I mean, I don't think I've set this for 6 sentencing until sometime in October, so 1st of September?
- MS. THOMAS: All right. I'll file it in both cases, if that's all right, since we'll be dealing with the law in both cases.
  - THE COURT: Yeah, those are the only two of these, of this set of cases, that involve 1001, right?
- 12 MS. THOMAS: That's correct.

10

11

17

18

19

- THE COURT: And I think we would all agree that on tax-evasion cases, that the heightened standard would apply, and I believe that's how I instructed the defendant -- defendants in those cases.
  - MS. THOMAS: And that's correct. And we are not seeking the standard to be that the defendant needs to know the specific provision of the law as you would --
- 20 THE COURT: Well, unfortunately, there is some
  21 language in some of these cases that might hint at that, but I
  22 think that's ridiculous. To expect a defendant to know the
  23 law, chapter and verse, is silly. So, but I think they -24 where Congress -- this is the way the Courts have treated it.
- 25 | I'm not sure this is what Congress intended. I'm not sure

what Congress intended actually.

But with regard to tax cases, the approach I have taken is that, at least a general matter, is the defendant had to have some sense that the defendant was doing something that either the law specifically forbid or was failing to do something that the law required, not chapter and verse, but simply know, for example, that filing a false tax return is unlawful, is forbidden by the law. I think my take on this has always been that in that very narrow category of mostly tax and I guess structuring — it also applies to structuring, that you have — basically, you have exception to the notion that ignorance of the law is not an excuse. In those cases, there has to be some knowledge of the law and some understanding of the law to be able to violate it.

In every other case, this is my perspective, up until now, where the word "willfully" is used, it is indistinguishable from the word "knowingly" or "intentionally." That's -- that's the approach that I've taken. Because that standard, the knowingly standard, is that the defendant simply had to know what he or she was doing. Absolutely no need to know it was unlawful, but simply know that they were doing something that, as it turns out, was forbidden by the law. But they didn't have to know anything about the law in order to be guilty of it. That's a pretty standard notion of what "knowingly" is, and, generally, in my

view, at least up until now, applies in most federal criminal cases.

MS. THOMAS: I think the distinction that the United States is putting forth in these cases is that the defendant had to act with a bad purpose to disobey the law. And I realize it might become academic at some point, but we -- I will certainly provide briefing to the Court by September the 1st.

THE COURT: Well, I would welcome that, and I think that this is the occasion that I'm going to have to, you know, make a call on this and let everybody kind of know where I'm coming from on this troublesome term.

Judge King authored an opinion, I think the name of the case is Bursey, where he talks about having a -- what's the language? -- the defendant had to have -- he's wrestling with a statute which I believe in that case forbid a person from being -- and I'm paraphrasing this -- in the presence of a security perimeter unlawfully. And where he came out on that one was -- and that one was phrased kind of similarly to this statute. And where he came out on that one was that the defendant had to have some knowledge of the general unlawful nature of his activity. I have no idea what that means. It seems to me you either know it's against the law or you don't. If you do know it's against the law, then the tax version of "willfully" would apply, and if you don't know it's against

the law, then we're at "knowingly." I really don't know where you would come -- I don't know where you'd come out with a hybrid of that.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I understand that some courts have recognized that there is like three levels of willfully. That middle level doesn't make a bit of sense to me. Either you knew what you were doing was unlawful or you didn't or, more accurately, you had to know it was unlawful or you didn't, and I don't see how you can sort of know it's generally unlawful, but without slipping into a requirement that you have to know what the law is. That doesn't make any sense to me. But just because it doesn't make any sense to me doesn't mean it's not right. just means I'm not smart enough to figure it out. So that's a possibility, too. But this is a summary of a much longer -several much longer discussions I've had among my law clerks which rather rapidly become very academic and very theoretical and, unfortunately, not very useful when it comes to the application of law to facts in real-world cases. So that's a long-winded way of saying I look forward to your submission.

And, Mr. Hissam, if you would like to weigh in on this, you can. If your client -- you and your client don't want to weigh in on this or participate in the discussion, you don't have to. But I think it would be useful for me to clarify my perspective on it, given my history of being a sort of a stickler on factual-basis issues and wanting to make sure

that all those I's are dotted and T's are crossed.

So, now, the question is if I come to the conclusion that the definition of "willfully" is something other than what I recited today, do you have any objection to us simply revisiting that issue briefly at sentencing?

MS. THOMAS: We would not have an objection.

MR. HISSAM: Not from the defendant, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, then I will -- you want to set two weeks after Ms. Thomas's submission as a deadline to submit something?

MR. HISSAM: Yes, Your Honor. At this point, this is new to us. I wasn't aware of the department's position in these cert oppositions. But we certainly would plan to take a look at it and, if necessary, file something with the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I will leave it up to you. Neither one of you has to file anything, but I'll give you until then to file something, and then I'll probably write something on this and try to -- try to at least put it to rest in my mind, and in a way that -- the one thing I would strive for is greater clarity than what exists in the law right now. Whether or not I get it right will have to be reserved for another day. Probably what I'll have to do after that is when I -- at one of these plea hearings, I'll reference my opinion in these cases and say this is my perspective on "willfully" and that will guide me in terms of plea hearings, factual

bases, and jury instructions from here on out. And everybody will at least know where I'm coming from on it, and there will be something in writing that if someone wants to take it up, I'll be more than happy to have them do that.

All right. Let's move on.

Mr. Barnette, I now want to go over with you the maximum and any minimum sentences you may face as a result of your plea, and that is a maximum term of imprisonment of five years, a maximum fine of \$250,000 or twice the gross pecuniary gain or loss resulting from your conduct, whichever is greater, a maximum term of supervised release of three years. A mandatory special assessment of \$100 would be required. Restitution could be ordered if it were found to be applicable.

Next I want to return to our discussion of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines. They are advisory, meaning they are not mandatory and don't have to be followed, but they will, nevertheless, play an important role in your case from here on out.

This Court will consider the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), including the advisory guidelines, in determining the appropriate sentence in your case. And now I want to ask you some questions that will help me to understand your understanding of the advisory guidelines.

Have you discussed with your attorney the various

factors which apply in determining what the sentence in your case may be under the advisory guidelines?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And do you understand that on the single-count information, you cannot in any event receive a greater sentence than the statutory maximum that I explained to you earlier?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand the Court will not determine the sentence for your case until a later date when a presentence report has been completed and both you and the government have had an opportunity to challenge the facts and analysis reported by the probation officer?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that under a concept known as relevant conduct, this Court, in determining the total offense level for sentencing purposes under the guidelines, may take into account any conduct, circumstances or injuries relevant to the crime of which you may be convicted?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that after the Court has determined what advisory guidelines apply to your case, the Court has the authority to vary or depart from the advisory guidelines and impose a sentence that is more severe

or less severe than the sentence called for by the guidelines? 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Do you understand that in determining your sentence, the Court is obligated to calculate the 4 5 applicable sentencing guideline range and to consider that 6 range, possible departures under the guidelines, and other 7 sentencing factors under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Do you understand that parole has been abolished, and if you are sentenced to prison, you will not be 10 released on parole? 11 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Do you understand if the Court accepts your plea of guilty and the sentence ultimately imposed upon 14 15 you is more severe than you had hoped for or expected, you will still be bound by your quilty plea and would have no 16 right to withdraw it? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 18 19 THE COURT: Do you understand if you plead guilty to 20 the single-count information which charges you with a felony, 21 you may lose important civil rights such as the right to vote, 22 the right to serve on a jury, the right to hold public office, 23 and the right to own or possess a firearm? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Now, Mr. Barnette, you have the right to

have this matter presented to a federal grand jury. I will explain that process to you briefly. A grand jury is composed of at least 16 and not more than 23 persons, and at least 12 grand jurors must find that there is probable cause to believe that you committed the crime with which you are charged before you may be indicted.

Now, do you see any benefit to having this case presented to a federal grand jury?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you see any prejudice or disadvantage to you of not having the case presented to a grand jury?

12 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

with a waiver-of-indictment form, and I want to go over that with you now. It's contains what we call the style of the case, United States of America versus Ronald Barnette, the criminal action number, it's entitled "Waiver of Indictment," and it states as follows: "I, Ronald Barnette, am accused of violating 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(2). I have been advised of the nature of the charge, of the proposed information, and of my rights. I hereby waive in open court prosecution by indictment and consent that the proceeding may be by information rather than by indictment."

There is a space for you to sign and date, a space for your counsel to sign, and a space for me to sign. Now, do

1 | you understand what I just read to you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And is there anything about it that you don't -- about the waiver-of-indictment process that you don't understand or you have questions about?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. If you're ready to do so then, I'll ask that you execute the waiver-of-indictment form by signing and dating it, then I'll ask your counsel to sign it and tender it to the Court.

MR. HISSAM: May I approach, Your Honor?

12 THE COURT: You may.

All right. I will note for the record that the defendant has signed and dated the waiver-of-indictment form, it has been witnessed by his counsel and I'll order -- and I'm now signing it, and I will order that it be made part of the record for this proceeding.

Next, Mr. Barnette, I want to talk with you regarding your trial and constitutional rights. You have the right to continue -- I'm sorry. You have the right to plead not guilty and maintain a not-guilty plea throughout these proceedings, including at trial. You have the right to be represented by counsel. You have the right to a speedy and public trial by a jury composed of citizens of this district. You have the right to confront and have your attorney cross-examine

witnesses and have your attorney move to suppress any evidence 1 he believes was illegally or unconstitutionally obtained. You have the right not to testify or otherwise incriminate yourself and your exercise of this right cannot be held 4 5 against you. Do you understand these rights so far? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: You have the right to have the government 8 come in here and prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. The jury's verdict would have to be unanimous. You have the right to present evidence on your own behalf. You have the 10 right to testify on your own behalf at trial. And you have 11 the right to subpoena witnesses to testify for you. Do you 12 13 understand all of these rights? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: Any of them that you don't understand or 16 you have questions about? 17 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 18 THE COURT: Other than your right to counsel, do you 19 understand that you will be giving up all these rights by 20 entering a plea of guilty? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: Do you understand that once you've 23 entered a plea of quilty, there is not going to be a trial, no 24 jury verdict, and no findings of innocence or guilt based on 25 disputed evidence presented to me or to the jury?

# ——PLEA HEARING ——

1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
2	THE COURT: Do you believe that you fully understand
3	the consequences of entering a plea of guilty?
4	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
5	THE COURT: And, Mr. Hissam, having reviewed this
6	case and the plea agreement in detail with your client, do you
7	believe that he fully understands his rights and fully
8	understands the consequences of entering a plea of guilty?
9	MR. HISSAM: Yes, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: All right. I note that there is a
11	stipulation of facts. Do the parties have any objection to
12	the Court utilizing that in its consideration of the factual
13	basis?
14	MS. THOMAS: No, Your Honor.
15	MR. HISSAM: No, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: All right. Very well. The Court will so
17	proceed.
18	I do intend to defer a factual-basis finding until
19	sentencing.
20	Mr. Barnette, will you please stand.
21	As to the charge contained in the single-count
22	information, how do you plead, sir? Guilty or not guilty?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
24	THE COURT: You may be seated.
25	Your counsel has been provided with a written

plea-of-quilty form. I would ask that you go over that with 1 2 him if necessary, sign and date it, and then I will ask him to sign it and tender it to the Court. 4 MR. HISSAM: May I approach, Your Honor? 5 THE COURT: You may. 6 All right. I will note for the record that the 7 defendant has signed and dated the written plea-of-quilty form 8 and it has been witnessed by his counsel, and I will order that it be made a part of the record for this proceeding. Mr. Barnette, is this plea the result of any threat 10 or coercion or harassment of you by anyone? 11 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 12 13 THE COURT: Is it the result of any promise or inducement other than is contained in the plea agreement? 14 15 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty to protect anyone? 17 18 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 19 THE COURT: Are you acting voluntarily and of your 20 own free will in entering this guilty plea? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 21 22 THE COURT: Has anyone promised or predicted the 23 exact sentence which will be imposed upon you in this matter? 24 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 25 THE COURT: Do you understand no one could know at

# ——PLEA HEARING ——

1	this time the exact sentence which will be imposed?
2	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
3	THE COURT: Has your attorney adequately represented
4	you in this matter?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
6	THE COURT: Has your attorney left anything unknown
7	which you think should have been known?
8	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
9	THE COURT: Have you or your attorney found any
10	defense to the charge contained in the information?
11	(Conversation held off the record between defense
12	counsel and the defendant.)
13	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
14	THE COURT: All right. Just to be sure, have you all
15	found any defense to the charge contained in this information?
16	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
17	THE COURT: All right. Are you, in fact, guilty of
18	the crime charged in the information, in other words, did you
19	do it?
20	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
21	THE COURT: All right. I will find that the
22	defendant is competent and capable of entering an informed
23	plea, that the plea is freely and voluntarily made, that the
24	defendant understands the nature of the charges and is aware
25	of the consequences of the plea. I will find that the

defendant understands his rights and understands that he's giving up these rights by entering a plea of guilty.

I will defer a factual-basis finding, I will accept the plea of guilty, and I will defer adjudging the defendant guilty until the time of sentencing.

I will ask the probation officer to prepare a presentence investigation report. Mr. Barnette, it is important that you cooperate fully with the probation officer in the preparation of the presentence report. If you fail to cooperate fully and truthfully with the probation officer, you may be subject to an enhancement of your sentence and the forfeiture of certain sentence reductions for which you might otherwise be eligible.

It's also important that you not commit any additional crimes between now and sentencing as there may be additional punishments imposed for committing additional crimes.

I'm going to set this matter for sentencing on October 20th, 2014, at 3 p.m. I will put my other presentencing dates in my post-plea order.

Ms. Thomas, what's the government's position with regard to bond?

MS. THOMAS: No opposition for the defendant to be on bond.

25 THE COURT: All right. Hearing no objection, I will

- place the defendant on \$10,000 unsecured bond under the standard conditions, as well as those recommended in the Pretrial Services report.
- I've signed my part of the paperwork already.

  Mr. Hissam, you and your client just need to take care of the rest of it with the Courtroom Deputy at the conclusion of the

7 hearing.

8

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

- MR. HISSAM: Your Honor, if I could address one modification to the standard bond condition. For Mr. Barnette's businesses, he has occasion to travel to the Western District of Virginia and the Eastern District of Kentucky, and we would ask the Court's permission that he be allowed to travel to those two districts in addition to the Southern District.
- THE COURT: Is there any objection?
- MS. THOMAS: No objection.
  - THE COURT: All right. I will allow that. I suppose we're going to have to modify the paperwork. It might just take a couple minutes. But probation has no problem with that, either?
- THE PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Okay. Very well. So we'll go ahead and take care of that paperwork. Anything else we need to take care of today?
- MS. THOMAS: No, Your Honor.

MR. HISSAM: No, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 3 THE LAW CLERK: All rise. THE COURT: Ms. Thomas -- let's go back on the record 4 5 real quick. 6 Ms. Thomas, I will ask you to notify Mr. Gillooly 7 with regard to the deadlines we talked about. 8 MS. THOMAS: I will. 9 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. This Court is adjourned. 10 THE LAW CLERK: (The proceedings concluded at 3:50 p.m.) 11 12 13 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 14 I, Carol Farrell, CRR, RMR, CCP, RPR, Official Court 15 Reporter of the United States District Court for the Southern 16 17 District of West Virginia, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings are a true and accurate transcript of 18 the testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at 19 the time, place, and on the date hereinbefore set forth. 20 21 I further certify that I am neither related to any of the 22 parties by blood or marriage, nor do I have any interest in 23 the outcome of the above matter. 24 25 /S/ Carol Farrell, CRR, RMR, CCP, RPR